

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, 15 and 19-20 are amended for clarity. Applicant has amended the preamble of independent claims 1 and 8. The claims are consistent with the specification and with independent claim 21 as they generally relate to database synchronization in a network.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,098,076 to Rekieta. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites at least one or more network elements which compare block units of information in a common memory storing current status information and information in a sync-related memory storing previous status information, the at least one or more network elements transmitting data results of the comparison. Independent claim 1 also recites a network element management system which stores the data results of the comparison transmitted from the network elements for thereby monitoring and managing the network elements in real time.

Rekieta does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action appears to assert that Rekieta's shared memory 72 (FIG. 3) corresponds to the claimed common memory and Rekieta's memory storage device 80 (FIG. 3) corresponds to the claimed sync-related memory. The Office Action then also asserts that Rekieta's IPU database manager 66/68/70 corresponds to the claimed network element management system. However, applicant respectfully disagrees that Rekieta teaches or suggest all the claimed features.

Reply to Office Action dated December 21, 2005

More specifically, Rekieta discloses a shared memory 72 and a mirrored storage device 80/82. See col. 6, line 62-col. 7, line 40 describing the methodology in which particular files are provided from the IPU (such as IPU 60) to one of the mirrored memories 80 (or 82). In particular, when a file system is mounted on an IPU, its files are then mapped into the shared memory. See col. 6, lines 65-67. Transient updates may occur and these updates are made only to the shared memory of the IPU. See col. 7, lines 4-6. On the other hand, static data updates may be written also immediately onto disks as well as updated in the shared memory. See col. 7, lines 6-9. Further, Rekieta specifically discloses that on an ongoing basis, sections of the files mapped to an IPU'S shared memory are written to the mirrored disk simultaneously to update the copy contained therein. See col. 7, lines 8-13. Thus, there is no suggestion for any comparison of block units of information in a common memory and information in a sync-related memory as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, Rekieta clearly describes how updates occur. The described comparison is not based on the claimed comparison.

The Office Action also references Rekieta's FIG. 17 and col. 14, lines 1-19 for features relating to synchronization. However, FIG. 17 and col. 13, line 55-col. 14, line 19 relate to a synchronization between different SCP databases (such as for each SCP 26a and 26b of an SCP pair). Applicant respectfully notes that the features shown in FIG. 3 would be provided within one of the SCP. In other words, FIG. 3 shows one SCP. As is specifically described in col. 13 and col. 14, an IPU sync process determines which records of the transient and/or voice mail that has changed and stores the changed record in a sync buffer. When the sync buffer is full, the IPU sync sends the contents of the sync buffer to the corresponding IPU of its mate SCP.

Reply to Office Action dated December 21, 2005

Accordingly, changed records are transferred to a different SCP. This description in col. 13, line 55-col. 14, line 19 does not relate to the transfer of data between the shared memory 72 and the mirror memory 80. Rather, this update refers to different SCPs. Accordingly, the citation to col. 14, lines 1-19 does not correspond with the transfer of data between elements 72 and 80 in FIG. 3.

Even further, the Office Action appears to allege that Rekleta's IPU database manager 60 (or 68 or 70) corresponds to the claimed network element management system. However, Rekleta does not disclose that the IPU database manager 60 stores data results of the comparison transmitted from the network elements (i.e., from a comparison of shared memory 72 and mirrored storage device 80).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Rekleta does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites comparing block units of information in a common memory which reflects database information of said network elements with block units of information in a sync-related memory which stores data prior to a certain period. Independent claim 8 also recites transmitting only modified block data, as a result of said comparison, to said network element management system. Independent claim 8 further recites storing said transmitted data in the memory of the network element management system. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Rekleta does not teach or suggest these features of independent claim 8. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Still further, independent claim 21 recites comparing blocks of information in a common memory of a network element with blocks of information in a sync-related memory of the network element, and transmitting data from the network element to a management system based on the comparison. Independent claim 21 also recites storing the transmitted information in the management system. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Rekieta does not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 21 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 8 and 21 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, dependent claims 4-6 relate to a sync-related memory, a common memory and a database of the network element management system. See elements 100, 101, 103, 104 and 102 of FIG. 2 as one example. The Office Action does not specifically address these features. Applicants respectfully submit that Rekieta does not teach or suggest these features. Thus, dependent claims 4-6 define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-24 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. **09/469,307**

Docket No. **P-0056**

Reply to Office Action dated December 21, 2005

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: March 21, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610